

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed September 11, 2006 in the present application, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. Claims 1-15 were pending in this application. Claims 1, 7 and 12 are amended. New claims 16-24 are added and no claims are canceled. Accordingly, claims 1-24 are now pending in this application, of which claims 1, 7, 12 and 22 are independent.

In this Response, Applicants' silence with regard to the Examiner's rejections of dependent claims constitutes a recognition by the Applicants that the rejections are moot based on the Remarks relative to the independent claim from which the dependent claims depend. Applicants reserve the option to further prosecute the same or similar claims in the instant or a subsequent application.

Previous Communications

In a telephone interview with Applicants' attorney on 28 August, 2006, the Examiner indicated that the claims would be allowable if amended to include a useful, concrete and tangible result. The Examiner suggested, as an example, that the claims be amended to include "providing or displaying results to a user". However, Applicants were unable to provide proposed amendments prior to the issuance of the current Office Action dated September 11, 2006.

In a telephone interview with the Examiner on November 30, 2006, Applicants' attorney presented for consideration proposed amendments to the claims in the form suggested by the Examiner. In accordance with the Examiner's request during the interview, Applicants subsequently provided the proposed amendments to the Examiner via facsimile on December 6, 2006.

In a telephone interview on January 11, 2007, the Examiner indicated that the proposed amendments provided via facsimile to the Examiner would not overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101(e) in the Office Action dated September 11, 2006. The Examiner suggested that amending the claims to incorporate further definition of the terms therein may overcome the rejection.

Claim Rejections

In the Office Action dated September 11, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 101(e) as being non-statutory subject matter. Applicants traverse the rejection and request reconsideration in light of the amendments and remarks herein.

Claims 1, 7 and 12 are amended to further define the first data elements as representative of usage of a data processing system, to more clearly recite that the classification outputs are indicative of classes of the first data elements and/or to provide outputting of the rules to a user. Claim 1 recites the practical application of the method to a processing system such that the rules governing the relationships between data representative of usage of the processing system and classifications of the data are output to a user. Claim 22 recites a similar practical application of its method to a processing system.

Claims 7 and 12 respectively recite a system and a program disposed on processor-readable medium, each having the practical application of generating and outputting rules indicative of the relationships between first data elements input into the data classifier of the system and classification outputs of the data classifier. Further, claim 7 recites physical components (hardware) in the form of a classifier and a rule inducer and not abstract software modules.

Each of claims 1, 7 12 and 22 recite a tangible result being the set of rules by which a user can classify usage of a processing system and/or input data elements.

Additionally, the amendments to claims 1, 7 and 12 correspond to the Examiner's suggestions provided in the phone interview of January 11, 2007, for overcoming the rejection. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1, 7, 12 and 22 are in condition for allowance and allowance is respectfully requested. Claims 2-6, 16 and 17 depend from claim 1; claims 8-11, 18 and 19 depend from claim 7; claims 13-15, 20 and 21 depend from claim 12; and claims 23 and 24 depend from claim 22. Each of the dependent claims is allowable at least by dependency.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, this application should now be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 9, 2007

Customer No: 25181

Patent Group

Foley Hoag, LLP

155 Seaport Blvd.

Boston, MA 02210-2600

/Robert W. Gauthier/

Robert W. Gauthier, Reg. No. 35,153

Attorney for Applicants

Tel. No. (617) 832-1175

Fax. No. (617) 832-7000